

## Chapter 6: Comments and Coordination

Early and continual coordination with the public, local communities and agencies is an essential part of the environmental process. Coordination with the agencies is important when determining the scope of the environmental documentation, level of analysis, potential impacts, and mitigation measures. Input from the public was highly valuable when developing the purpose and need for the project, identifying potential solutions and project alternatives, and understanding and addressing social impacts.

A variety of methods and tools have been used to gather important feedback on the future of this corridor. These methods and tools are listed in the table below.

Table 6-1: Summary of Public and Agency Involvement and Coordination Activities

Activity	Date	Target Group
Agency Scoping Letter	January 25 & 31, 2007	Resource Agencies (see Appendix A for a complete list)
Agency Scoping Meeting	February 12, 2007	Resource Agencies (see Appendix A for a complete list)
Public Open House	February 22, 2007	General Public
Scoping Letter	March 14, 2007	Native American Tribes
Website, Comment Forms, Outreach Materials, and Media Coordination	Various Dates	General Public
Political Leader Workshop	May 21, 2007	City Legislative Representatives
Political Leader Workshop	August 20, 2007	City Legislative Representatives
Highland City Council Meeting	September 4, 2007	City Representatives
Public Open House	September 19, 2007	General Public
Political Leader Workshop	October 1, 2007	City Legislative Representatives
Mountainland Association of Governments Open House	October 24, 2007	General Public
Public Open Houses (3)	March 25, 26 & 27, 2008	General Public
Public Hearing	September 25, 2008	General Public

This chapter will summarize the results of the project team's efforts to fully engage the public and agencies when identifying, addressing, and resolving project-related issues. All written comments regarding the project that have been received to date are included in the administrative record. Responses to comments will be included in Section 6.5 after the public comment period has ended and responses have been given to all comments that warrant a reply. All relevant correspondence relating to agencies, the general public, special interest groups, and Native American Tribes can be found in Appendix A.

## 6.1 SCOPING PROCESS

The scoping process involved activities to engage the public and resource agencies and included the following:

- In January of 2007, a scoping letter was sent out to all applicable public agencies informing them of the SR-92 project and inviting them to an agency scoping meeting. (See Appendix A for a copy of this scoping letter.)
- A formal agency scoping meeting was conducted on February 12, 2007 at H.W. Lochner in Salt Lake City.
- A public scoping open house was held at IM Flash Technologies in Lehi on February 22, 2007. (See the *Public Scoping Meeting* section below for more details regarding the open house.)

### **Agency Scoping Meeting**

To inform external agencies about the project and give them a chance to ask questions and provide comments, the project team held an agency scoping meeting on February 12, 2007 at the H.W. Lochner office in Salt Lake City, Utah. Although 27 agencies were invited, none sent representatives to attend the meeting. Through telephone conversations or written correspondence, some of the agencies requested to be kept informed or provided comments. The meeting was modified for internal discussion to discuss comments received from the resource agencies prior to February 12, 2007. Table 6-2 summarizes comments received from agencies through the scoping process.

Table 6-2: Agency Coordination

Agency	Date	Subjects/Issues
United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)	January 27, 2006	Section 7 guidance.
Frontier	January 5, 2007	Community development, zoning.
Utah County Community Development	January 5, 2007	Zoning for unincorporated areas within Utah County.
Frontier	January 7, 2007	Invasive weeds, wildlife resources.
Frontier	January 8, 2007	Invasive weeds.
Utah County Weed Coordinator	January 17, 2007	Location of invasive weeds.
Utah Department of Natural Resources (UDNR), Division of Wildlife Resources (DWR)	January 17, 2007	No occurrences of T&E species. Wants project team to look at possible mitigation measures for collisions between motorists and big game.
Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS)	January 24, 2007	Location of soils that meet definition of <i>prime farmland if irrigated</i> or <i>farmland of statewide importance</i> .
Resource Agencies (see Appendix A for a complete list)	January 31, 2007	Scoping invitation letter, project map.
Frontier	February 15, 2007	Species list.
Utah Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), Division of Drinking Water (DDW)	February 20, 2007	Location of public drinking water facilities.
Utah Resource Development Coordinating Committee (representing the Division of Air Quality [DAQ])	February 22, 2007	Use best management practices (BMPs) to minimize fugitive dust, approval order required if any "non-permitted" plants are used
DDW	February 26, 2007	Leaking underground storage tank.
USFWS	February 28, 2007	Endangered species list.

Agency	Date	Subjects/Issues
Utah Department of Natural Resources (UDNR), Division of Water Resources	March 8, 2007	No comments.
United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Region 8	March 9, 2007	Wants project team to take a rigorous look at cumulative effects—especially air quality—to consider indirect impact of growth, to consider increase in travel to American Fork Canyon, and to clarify whether access to Alpine Loop is part of the purpose and need.
DEQ, Division of Environmental Response and Remediation (DERR)	March 9, 2007	Location of leaking underground storage tanks.
United States Forest Service (USFS), Pleasant Grove Ranger District	March 12, 2007	Wants project team to provide safe and convenient access to proposed interagency administrative visitor facility complex.
United States Department of the Interior (DOI), National Park Service (NPS)	March 12, 2007	No comments.
United States Department of Agriculture (USDA)	March 12, 2007	NPS, USFS facility plans.
UDNR, Utah Geological Survey (UGS)	March 20, 2007	No recorded paleontological localities in the project area.
NPS, Midwest Region	March 21, 2007	No conflicts with Land and Water Conservation Fund and the Urban Park and Recreation Recovery programs.
NPS, Timpanogos Cave National Monument	March 22, 2007	Wants project team to provide access to proposed interagency administrative visitor facility complex.
National Park Service, Intermountain Region	March 28, 2007	No comments.
UDNR, Parks and Recreation	April 12, 2007	No potential impacts to 6(f) land.
DEQ DWQ	April 24, 2007	Potential impacts, conditions, and permits.
DEQ DWQ	April 27, 2007	Wants project team to use BMPs to control erosion and to avoid concentration of storm water to fewer discharge locations. Requested conditions for mitigation.
United States Bureau of Reclamation	November 5, 2007	Acceptance of invitation to become a cooperating agency.

### **Public Scoping Meeting**

To inform the public about the project and give them a chance to ask questions and provide comments, the project team held a public scoping open house. The open house was held on February 22, 2007 at IM Flash Technologies in Lehi, Utah. The objective of the open house was to

identify the needs and context of the corridor according to those who use it most. The open house featured the following materials and tools:

- Informational boards outlining the following:
  - Objectives of the open house and the project goals.
  - Overview of the environmental process and environmental factors that need to be taken into consideration.
  - Project team's approach to the project.
  - Project schedule.
  - Opportunities for the public to provide comments.
  - Summary of the issues identified to date.
  - Regulatory considerations.
  - Study area features.
  - Public outreach methods and tools that would be utilized throughout the duration the project.
- An information sheet that included a project introduction, the goals of the project, a project overview and schedule, and project team contact information (available in the quarterly public involvement reports).
- Comment Form 1. (See Section 6.4 and quarterly public involvement reports for more detail.)
- Scroll plot maps.

Scroll maps of the project area were used to allow open house attendees to place comments directly on specific locations throughout the corridor. Typical comments were placed on problematic areas like where accidents occur, where the road needs to be widened, and where there is a lot of congestion. The materials from the open house were placed on the project website so those who could not attend the meeting could view the information.

The project team listened to many comments from community members and interested parties. Most of the comments received during that early public scoping process reflected the communities' desire to alleviate traffic congestion by adding capacity to the corridor. For more details regarding comments, please see Section 6.4.

## **6.2 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION WITH PUBLIC AGENCIES**

Consultation with agencies and other interested parties has been conducted throughout the project using letters, phone calls, and/or emails. Meetings have also been held to resolve issues or concerns when necessary. Table 6.2 provides an overview of the agencies that the project team has coordinated regarding specific project elements. All correspondence has been included in Appendix A.

## **6.3 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION WITH NATIVE AMERICAN TRIBES**

For Section 106, Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) coordinated with the following Native American Tribes:

- Northwestern Band of the Shoshone Nation
- Shoshone-Bannock Tribes
- Skull Valley Band of Goshutes
- Bureau of Indian Affairs

The Skull Valley Band of Goshute Indians requested to remain informed about the project but did not identify any concerns about the project or request to be a consulting party. The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes expressed concern over a prehistoric archaeological site (previously determined to be ineligible for the National Register of Historic Places [NRHP]) along the corridor and are reviewing a copy of the *SR-92 Cultural Resources Technical Report* to determine if any additional consultation is necessary. No comment has been received from the Northwestern Band of Shoshone Nation. Correspondence with these tribes is included in Appendix A.

## **6.4 OTHER PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ACTIVITIES**

The SR-92 public participation program kicked off in February of 2007 and featured a variety of outreach methods. The public participation process sought to educate and involve the public on all aspects of the project and provide the public with multiple opportunities to comment on the project. This feedback educated the project team on what the needs and solutions for SR-92 are, based on the user experience. The following is a summary of the methods used throughout the course of the project.

### **Website**

A project website—[www.udot.utah.gov/sr-92](http://www.udot.utah.gov/sr-92)—was developed at the onset of the project. The website provided a project overview and schedule as well as a public involvement section where those interested in the project could find out about upcoming project events and download project outreach materials. A designated email address was also set up so those interested in commenting on the project or communicating with the project team could easily do so. All inquiries were responded to within 24 business hours.

### **Comment Forms**

Three comment forms were developed throughout the duration of the project. The first comment form was launched in early 2007 and asked about the specific needs of the corridor. The second comment form was launched in the fall of 2007 and asked for input on solutions or alternatives for the corridor. After receiving comments that the developed solutions or alternatives did not adequately meet the needs of the users, the project team developed additional alternatives. The third comment form was launched in early spring of 2008 and asked for input on those additional alternatives. All three comment forms were available on the project website and in hard copy format. The hard copy format was distributed at public meetings and through the project team by request. (See the quarterly public involvement reports for copies of all three comment forms and their subsequent summaries.)

### **Media and Outreach Materials**

The media was utilized to further reach those who might be interested in the project. A total of four press releases and six advertisements and/or postcards—all of which are available in the quarterly public involvement reports—were sent to the media and the public during the course of the project. All outreach materials were placed on the project website to keep stakeholders informed and to announce upcoming project events.

### **Public Open Houses and Presentations**

See Section 6.1 for information regarding the first public open house.

A second public open house was held on September 19, 2007 at IM Flash Technologies in Lehi, Utah. The open house featured the following materials and tools:

- Informational boards that outlined the following:
  - Updated project schedule.
  - Objectives for the open house.
  - Environmental process.
  - Outcome of previous community outreach.
  - Purpose and need of the project.
  - Environmental resources and constraints.
  - Land use overview.
  - Alternatives.
  - Noise analysis and mitigation process.
  - Trails.
- Comment Form 2. (See the *Comment Forms* section above and the quarterly public involvement reports for more detail.)
- Scroll plot maps.

Scroll maps were used to allow attendees to comment on how well the solutions that were developed met their needs. Most of the comments received during that second public open house reflected the communities' desire to alleviate traffic congestion, facilitate bicyclists and pedestrians, minimize impacts to private property, and decrease travel time to I-15.

At this meeting, information about alternatives already developed was also given to the public. One alternative in particular—an alternative with discontinuous express lanes over two intersections—received numerous comments. The public requested that the express lanes in this alternative be extended from Highland City to I-15, which would create continuous express lanes on the project corridor. This response indicated that the discontinuous express lanes did not meet the public's needs. Following the meeting, the informational boards from the open house were placed on the project website, and the alternative was altered as requested to include continuous express lanes from Highland Boulevard to I-15.

On March 26 and 27, 2008, two more public and neighborhood meetings were held, one in Lehi and one in Highland. The purpose of these meetings was to gather input on the continuous express lanes alternative, which was developed after the last meeting. The public and neighborhood meetings featured the following materials and tools:

- Informational boards that included the following:
  - Updated project schedule.
  - Purpose and need of the project.
  - Alternatives considered and reasons for elimination or further examination.
  - Detailed information about the alternative being carried forward for further evaluation.
  - Typical sections.
  - Travel times.

- Comment Form 3. (See the *Comment Forms* section above and the quarterly public involvement reports for more detail.)
- Scroll plot maps.

### **Email Updates**

An extensive stakeholder database was developed and maintained throughout the duration of the project. The database included an extensive list of email addresses for those interested in the project. Email updates regarding the project's status, schedule, and upcoming activities were sent to stakeholders on a regular basis throughout the project.

### **Additional Coordination**

In addition to coordination with the general public, it was vital to the project to involve key stakeholders and, when necessary, meet one-on-one with individuals and/or special interest groups to assist with the resolution of specific issues and concerns. The project team contacted, coordinated, and/or met with the following entities throughout the duration of the project:

- Smith's Marketplace
- IM Flash Technologies
- Bull River Homeowners Association and Residents
- Highland City Resident Groups
- Traverse Mountain
- Huntington Heights
- Utah County
- Highland City
- City of Cedar Hills
- Lehi City
- Alpine City
- West Side Connector Project
- Mountain View Corridor Project
- Geneva Road Project
- I-15 Corridor Project
- SR-68 Project
- 1000 South Project
- 9600 North Project
- SR-146 Project
- Utah Transit Authority (UTA)
- Jordan Valley Water Conservancy District (JVWCD)
- Provo River Water Users Association (PRWUA)
- Bureau of Reclamation
- Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake and Sandy (MWDSL)
- Central Utah Water Conservancy District (CUWCD)
- Mountainland Association of Governments (MAG)
- URS Corporation
- Parsons Brinkerhoff
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
- Utah Division of Water Rights (DWRi)
- Water Masters for Local Ditches

### **Public Hearing**

Notification will be sent to all stakeholders in the database announcing the availability of the environmental assessment (EA) and the public hearing date, time, and location. There will be a 30-day public comment period following notice of this EA's availability. Any comments received during the public comment period will become part of the public record.

This section will be completed following the public hearing.

## **6.5 SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND RESPONSES**

Over the course of the project, the project team received hundreds of comments via comment forms, letters, and emails from those interested in the project. Copies of the comment forms and their subsequent summaries are available in the quarterly public involvement reports; email, letter, and phone correspondence records are also included in the quarterly public involvement reports and available upon request.

There were 272 respondents to Comment Form 1. The majority of respondents use the SR-92 corridor for I-15 access. Traffic congestion along the SR-92 corridor garnered the most responses: 86 percent of respondents stated that it is a concern. Seventy-five percent of respondents identified safety as a concern, and more than half of all respondents stated that the entire SR-92 corridor is a concern.

Comment Form 2 generated comments regarding a trail along the corridor, raised medians, express lanes, signals, right-of-way, aesthetics, and noise mitigation. All those who commented on raised medians were opposed to them; all those who commented on express lanes were in favor of them. Several respondents were concerned about potential impacts due to noise, and almost all of them requested berms to mitigate noise. Those concerned about right-of-way requested fewer than seven lanes through Highland or a shift of the roadway away from their private property.

Comment Form 3 was an open-ended comment form asking for any comments or questions regarding the project. Many of the comments centered around the request to have SR-92 moved to the north away from existing homes in the Huntington Heights development. Several comments were related to the express lane concept and to noise. A spreadsheet with all of the comments received is available in the quarterly public involvement reports.